and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee issued a 9,575 page report. Bipartisan legislation addressing the major issues was introduced and debated on the floor of the Senate and the House. Majorities on both sides of the Capitol voted in support of reform, to strengthen federal election laws. In the Senate, a majority supported the McCain-Feingold bill. In the House, a majority voted for the Shays-Meehan bill. Both bills sought to ban soft money, treat phony issue ads as campaign ads they are, strengthen disclosure, and streamline enforcement. Despite majority support in both Houses, we are ending this Congress without major campaign finance reform.

It is a tragedy. Given the controversy and criticisms following the 1996 elections, the failure to enact meaningful campaign finance reform is unjustifiable, it is inexplicable, and it is wrong.

As many of us have said repeatedly, the problem with the 1996 elections is that the vast majority of the conduct most loudly condemned was not illegal—it was legal. Most involved soft money—the solicitation and spending of undisclosed and unlimited election-related contributions, despite laws now on the books requiring federal campaign contributions to comply with strict limits and be disclosed. Virtually all the foreign contributions so loudly condemned involved soft money. Virtually every offer of access to the White House or the Capitol Building or to the President or the leadership of the Senate or the House involved contributions of soft money.

Opponents of campaign finance reform contend that soft money is not a problem and that the laws on the books do not need reform, but the truth is that legal limits which once had meaning have been virtually swallowed up by the loopholes. The limits on individual, corporate and individual contributions have become a sham. Campaign contribution limits, for all intents and purposes, do not exist.

The law now states, for example, that no one may contribute more than $1,000 per election to a candidate; no one may contribute more than $20,000 per year to a political party; and corporations and unions may not make federal campaign contributions at all except through a PAC. But the soft money loophole makes these limits meaningless. For example, under the current system, a corporation, union or individual can give $1 million to a candidate's party and have that party televise so-called issue ads in that candidate's district during the election, using an ad that is indistinguishable from candidate ads which have to be paid for with regulated funds. That's exactly what is happening. In the 1998 elections, for example, the Republican National Congressional Committee is conducting a $37 million advertising effort dubbed ''Operation Breakout'' in which the party runs television ads in areas where there are close Congressional races, claiming that the ads discuss issues and are not efforts to elect or defeat the candidates they mention by name. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee is spending $7 million on similar issue ads. These multi-million dollar advertising efforts by both parties demonstrate how the loopholes have effectively erased the campaign limits.

Other, more fundamental problems with current law are illustrated by a recent court decision, issued October 9th in the Charlie Trie prosecution, holding that the law as currently worded does not prohibit soft money contributions by foreign nationals.

The plain truth is that the federal election laws now on the books are too often unenforceable. While the Republican leadership rails at the Attorney General for not doing more and threatens her with impeachment for not appointing an independent counsel to investigate the 1996 federal elections, they simultaneously block efforts to clarify and strengthen the very laws that they say they want her to enforce.

The soft money loophole exists, because we in Congress allow it to exist. Foreign involvement in American election campaigns exists, because we in Congress allow it to exist. Phony issue ads exist, because we in Congress allow them to exist. Weak enforcement of campaign laws continues, because we in Congress allow the current loophole-ridden statutes to continue on the books unchanged.

It is long past time to stop pointing fingers at others and take responsibility for our share of the blame for this system. We alone write the laws. Congress alone can close the loopholes and reinvigorate the Federal election laws.

We could have made significant progress during this Congress. The House passed meaningful campaign finance reform. The majority of the Senate voted to do the same, but the Republican leadership brought sufficient pressure to bear so that the chief sponsor of the legislation in the Senate, Senator MCCAIN, withdrew his reform amendment to the Interior appropriations bill. We had 52 votes in favor of his amendment to include the McCain-Feingold legislation in that bill. But rather than allow the majority to prevail, the Republican leadership sank the campaign finance reform effort. And when Senator FEINGOLD announced his intention to offer the same amendment again to force another vote, the leadership chose to pull the Interior bill from the Senate floor. And since the Interior appropriations bill was pulled from the Senate floor in September, there has been no must-pass bill on the Senate floor that supporters could seek to amend to forward the campaign finance reform effort.

Instead the Interior bill, along with a number of other appropriations bills, have been folded into a so-called omnibus appropriations bill. That means that anyone who wants to enact campaign finance reform by amending the omnibus spending bill would be forced to hold up almost all government appropriations—essentially to shut down the government—in order to debate the issue.

The question is whether these strong-arm tactics will prevail. Whether, given the obstacles thrown in the path of campaign finance reform, we give up this fight or whether we continue to press on. Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD have said publicly that they will be back in the next Congress to fight for reform. I plan to stand with them. I believe the stakes are nothing less than the integrity of our electoral system.

The time is over for empty rhetoric about the 1996 campaign and the need for stronger enforcement of the campaign laws already on the books. The laws now on the books are too often unenforceable, and everyone knows it. It is time to wipe away the crocodile tears and see clearly what the American people see. Campaign finance reform is long overdue.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, we are now in the closing days of this congressional session. A lot is happening in these final hours. With the clock ticking we almost always knuckle down and get things done. But it has become clear that one thing that this Congress will not do before it adjourns is pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

Today I want to serve notice that this fight is not over. If the people of Wisconsin in their wisdom send me back to this chamber next year, the Senate will hear about campaign finance reform again and vote on campaign finance reform again because our democracy has been made sick by the corrupting influence of big money, and the future of our country is at stake.

And Mr. President, this fight will continue regardless of what I say. Because the fight for campaign finance reform is bigger than any one Senator or any one political party. It is as big as the idea of representative democracy itself, and just as resilient. This is a fight for the soul and the survival of our American democracy. This democracy cannot survive without the confidence of the people in the legislative and the electoral process. The prevalence—no—the dominance—of money in our system of elections and our legislature will in the end cause them to crumble. If we don't take steps to clean up this system it ultimately will consume us along with our finest American ideals.

Mr. President, there has been alot of discussion on this floor in recent weeks about morality. Indeed, we are now engaged in a process, both constitutional and political, that may ultimately lead to an impeachment trial in this historic chamber. Questions of morality are at the center of that process, which has consumed much of the public's and the press's attention over the past several months.

I submit that questions of morality should be central in this body's treatment of the campaign finance issue. Along with millions of other Americans, religious leaders from across a wide spectrum of denominations have urged us to enact reform. They see how this corrupt system is undermining the moral authority of our government. How can we pretend to be following the dictates of conscience, and not politics, as we prepare to judge the President, while simultaneously ignoring this moral crisis in the process by which the people elect their representatives?

There has also been a lot of discussion about high crimes and misdemeanors.

I haven't decided yet whether the President's misbehavior meets that high standard. Many of the American people seem skeptical.

But they do think it's a crime that the tobacco companies can use money to block a bill to curtail teen smoking. They do think it's a crime that insurance companies can use money to block desperately needed health care reform. They do think it's a crime that telecommunication companies use money and can force a bill through Congress that's supposed to increase competition and decrease prices, but leads to cable rates that keep on rising and rising. And they do think it's a crime that corporations and unions are able to give unlimited soft money contributions to the political parties to advance their narrow special interests.

They think it's a crime. And you know what, it should be a crime. But here in Washington it is business as usual—until we manage to pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, it was very disappointing to me that 48 of our colleagues voted against the McCain-Feingold bill a few weeks ago, killing reform for this year. It was especially disappointing that we were unable to break through the filibuster here, after the enormous accomplishment of our colleagues in the other body who passed reform by a lopsided 252–179 margin.

It was especially disappointing that all the votes to kill our bill in the Senate came from one party. Facing the determined opposition of the leadership, reformers in the House succeeded not only in bringing campaign finance reform to the floor but in passing it with a strong bipartisan majority. When we failed to invoke cloture on the McCain-Feingold bill last month, we missed a golden opportunity to together do something positive for the American people on a bipartisan basis.

I emphasized the strong bipartisan vote in the House, Mr. President, because this effort has been a bipartisan effort all along. The senior Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, and the Senior Senator from Tennessee and Chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator THOMPSON, have been in the forefront of this effort from the beginning. Five other distinguished Republican Senators voted for the McCain-Feingold bill. In the House, fully ¼ of the Republican Members voted for the bill. Senator MCCAIN and I recognized a long time ago that a partisan campaign finance bill will never become law. A serious effort to actually do something about this problem, Mr. President, has to be bipartisan.

It is significant, Mr. President, that many of the leaders in this body on campaign finance reform were part of the Governmental Affairs Committee's year long investigation of campaign finance abuses in the 1996 campaign. Not only the Chairman, Senator THOMPSON, but two other highly respected Republican members of the committee, Senator COLLINS and Senator SPECTER, supported the McCain-Feingold bill. And Democratic members such as the Senator GLENN, Senator LEVIN, and Senator DURBIN, have also been very active and outspoken in pushing for reform. These Senators saw—up close and personal—how the excesses of the 1996 campaign stem from problems with the law, particularly the enormous loophole known as soft money.

I want to thank all of them for their hard work on the investigation and on this legislation, and promise them that their work shall not have been in vain. It is unfortunate that the investigation did not lead to legislative correction in this Congress, but the factual record they amassed remains the most powerful and detailed argument for reform, and it will undoubtedly shape our efforts in the future.

There are plenty of scandals in this scandal-obsessed town—but when it comes to campaign finance, the greatest scandal of all is not about laws that were broken. The greatest campaign finance scandal is about the outrageous practices and compromising contributions that are perfectly legal. Yes, those who broke the current campaign finance laws should be punished, but that will hardly begin to solve the problems in this corrupt campaign finance system.

We've heard the horror stories again and again. The parties have special clubs for big givers and offer exclusive meetings and weekend retreats with officeholders to the donors. And it's totally legal.

The tobacco companies have funneled nearly $17 million in soft money to the national political parties in the last decade, $4.4 million in 1997 alone when the whole issue of congressional action on the tobacco settlement was very much alive—and it's totally legal.

In 1996, the gambling industry gave nearly $4 million in soft money to the two major political parties at the same time that Congress was creating a new national commission on gambling, but with limited subpoena powers—and it's totally legal.

The National Republican Congressional Committee is engaged in a $37 million dollar effort called Operation Breakout, funded largely by soft money, to attack Democratic candidates with advertisements that aren't considered election ads and don't even have to be reported to the FEC because they don't use certain ''magic words'' like Vote For or Vote Against—and it's totally legal.

And we're even starting to extort money from our own colleagues. It was recently reported that Republican leaders actually threatened to deprive their own Members of appropriations subcommittee chairmanships if they didn't cough up up to $100,000 for the Operation Breakout plan. And it's totally legal.

There are some in this body, of course, despite what the Thompson investigation uncovered and what news stories show on almost a daily basis, who don't see or won't acknowledge the corrupting influence of these unlimited soft money contributions, which are now totally legal. In our most recent debate, the junior Senator from Utah gave us a history lesson intended to convince us that we should not fear enormous campaign contributions. He recounted the frequently told story of how Sen. Eugene McCarthy's Presidential campaign in 1968 was jump-started by some very large contributions by some very wealthy individuals.

He also noted that Steve Forbes was apparently prepared to make similarly enormous contributions to support Jack Kemp in a run for the Presidency in 1996, but was prohibited from doing so by the federal election laws and so decided to run his own campaign, a decision from which we might infer that the money is more important than the candidate. And he recounted as well the story of Mr. Arthur Hyatt, a wealthy businessman who gave large soft money contributions to the Democratic Party in 1996, but decided after that election not to give soft money to the parties anymore, and instead to fund an advocacy group that is promoting public financing of elections.

The point of these examples was supposed to be that wealthy donors are motivated by ideology and the desire to benefit the public as they see it rather than by the desire to gain access and influence with policy makers through their contributions. And I suppose that is sometimes the case. Of course, there is also the well known story of Roger Tamraz, who testified under oath to our Governmental Affairs Committee that he never even votes, and the only reason that he gave soft money to the DNC was to gain access to officials he thought could help him with his business. I mean no disrespect to the Senator from Utah and the civic-minded millionaires he cites, but Mr. Tamraz, I suspect, is more typical in his motives, if not his methods, of big contributors.

I'm not cynical, Mr. President. There is a reason that I hold that suspicion. And the reason is that the vast majority of soft money contributions to our political parties are coming from corporate interests. And it simply cannot

be argued that these interests are acting out of public spiritedness or ideological conviction. Corporations do not have an ideology, they have business interests. They have a bottom line to defend, and they have learned over the years that making contributions to the major political parties in this country is a very good investment in their bottom line. Campaign money buys access, and access pays off at the bottom line.

Corporate interests are special interests. Special interests have self-interested motives. They are concerned with profits, not what is best for other citizens or consumers or the country as a whole. They like to cast their arguments in terms of the public interest, and they certainly will argue that if the Congress follows their advice on legislation the public will be better off, but in the end it is their own businesses that they care about, not the public good. Indeed, the boards of directors and management of corporations have a legal duty to act in the best interests of their shareholders, not the public at large.

And I have no problem with that, and no illusions about it either. It's OK with me that the corporate special interests are looking out for number one in the public debate, but I object when their deep pockets give them deep influence that ordinary Americans don't have.

Take the tobacco companies. They oppose increasing the taxes paid by consumers of their products, they promote putting caps on the damages that smokers and their families can be awarded in personal injury or wrongful death actions, but they oppose ending government subsidies for tobacco farmers. In each case, they say they are supporting the public interest, but in the end they are protecting their own bottom line. And they have invested heavily in this Congress, and in our political parties, millions upon millions of dollars to protect their bottom line.

These are the folks who raised their right hands and swore that tobacco was not addictive. These are the companies that concealed crucial studies on the dangers of their product for years. These are the people who spent millions on a misleading advertising campaign to kill the most important public health initiative that the Congress considered this year because it threatened their economic health. I'm not willing to rely on them to look out for the public interest, particularly when the voices of opposing views can hardly be heard because they don't have a lot of money.

Most soft money donors are using their contributions like Roger Tamraz and the tobacco companies do. That is borne out by a recent study by Common Cause of the major soft money donors so far in this election cycle. The political parties have already raised over $116 million in soft money in this cycle, the most ever in a non-presidential cycle and more than twice the amount given in a similar 18 month period in the 1993–94 cycle.

As is always the case, corporations with business before the Congress, not disinterested, public-spirited millionaires, and certainly not ordinary citizens, are leading the way in soft money giving in this cycle. Securities and investment companies and their executives have given $8.5 million, the insurance industry has given $7.3 million, the telecommunications industry $6.1 million, the real estate industry $5.9 million, the pharmaceutical industry $4 million, and the tobacco industry $3.9 million. All of these amounts are at least double and in some cases triple the amount given in 1993–94.

And one very interesting set of contributors shows that access, not ideology, is the main reason for soft money donations. Fifty-seven donors in the first 18 months of this cycle gave more than $75,000 to both parties. 15 companies, including Philip Morris, AT&T, Walt Disney Co., MCI, Bell South Corporation, Atlantic Richfield and Archer Daniels Midland gave more than $150,000 to both parties.

Now I suppose there might be some in those companies, or even in this body, who will argue that all of these ''double-givers'' just really want to help the political process. That they are motivated not by their bottom line but by a deep desire to assist the parties in serving the public. But if that is the case, why is that in every Congress since I have been here the industries most seriously affected by our work pony up to give huge contributions to us and to the political parties?

In 1993–94 it was the health care debate. Hospitals, insurance companies, drug companies, and doctors all opened their wallets in an unprecedented way. Then in 1995 and 1996, the Telecommunications Act was under consideration and lo and behold the local and long distance companies and the cable companies stepped up their giving. Now in this Congress, we've been working on bankruptcy reform and financial services modernization, and the biggest givers of all in this cycle according to Common Cause's research report are securities and investment companies, insurance companies, and banks and lenders, eager to have their business interests protected or expanded. What's going on here? I submit that it's not a spontaneous burst of civic virtue. And if we don't finish work on these bills this year, you can bet that the money will be there for us in the Congress as well—it has been suggested that sometimes the very members of Congress who most want a big bill to pass will slow its progress to keep the checks coming in and the money flowing that much longer.

Mr. President, not surprisingly, there's also a powerful new player in the soft money game in this Congress—the computer and electronics industry. According to Common Cause, these companies have given the parties nearly $2.7 million so far, more than twice as much as they gave four years ago. And why is that, Mr. President? Could it have anything to do with the ongoing antitrust investigations and the possibility of congressional action in connection with those investigations? Or is it that the industry suddenly became more public spirited than it was in the past?

Mr. President, the American people are not gullible or naive. They know that these companies contribute these enormous sums to the parties because their bottom line is affected by what the Congress does and they want to make sure the Congress will listen to them when they want to make their case. And they know that the big contributors get results.

And frankly, Mr. President, it's a two way street. The parties are hitting up these donors because they know that most companies, unlike Monsanto and General Motors who announced early in 1997 that they would no longer make soft money donations—most companies don't have the courage to say no. Most companies are worried that if they don't ante up, their lobbyists won't get in the door. Our current campaign finance laws encourage old fashioned shakedowns, as long as they are done discreetly.

Faced with this kind of evidence, it is beyond me how any Senator could support this soft money system. We simply must pass comprehensive reform, including a ban on soft money at the beginning of the next Congress, and we must make that ban effective immediately to prevent the presidential election in the Year 2000 from being contaminated with this corrosive and corruptive force. The consequences of failing to make these reforms will be devastating to the confidence of average citizens in the fairness and impartiality of the legislative process and the actions of a future Chief Executive.

Let me be clear Mr. President, I'm not suggesting that any individual Member of Congress is corrupt. I don't know that any Member of this body has ever traded a vote for a contribution. But while Members are not corrupt, the system is riddled with corruption. It is only human to help those who have helped you get elected or re-elected, to agree to the meeting, to take the phone call, to allow the opportunity to be persuaded by those who have given money. It is true of the parties, and it is true of the Members, even those who seek always to cast their votes on the merits. The result is that people who don't have money don't get heard.

So we don't need to point fingers at one another, we just have to rise above politics and do the right thing by the American people. We must clean up our own house, Mr. President. We cannot continue to ignore the corruption in our midst, the cancer that is eating the heart out of the great American compact of trust and faith between the people and their elected representatives.

We know that unlimited soft money contributions make a mockery of our election laws and threatens the fairness of the legislative process. We

know that phony issue ads paid for with unlimited corporate and union funds undermine the ability of citizens to understand who is bankrolling the candidates and why. We can find bipartisan solutions to these problems that protect legitimate First Amendment rights if we are willing to put partisan political advantage aside and sit down and work it out.

Senator MCCAIN and I are ready—we have been ready ever since we introduced our bill—to make changes to our bill that will bring new supporters on board and get us past the 60 vote threshold that the Senate rules have placed in our way, so long as we stay true to the goal of a cleaner, fairer, system in which money will no longer dominate.

I look forward to continuing this work next year Mr. President. And I am confident that we will succeed. Again, I want to thank Senator MCCAIN and all the Republicans who joined our bill this year. And of course, Senator DASCHLE and all the Democratic Senators who have so steadfastly supported bipartisan reform in this Congress.

Mr. President, most important legislative accomplishments take more than one Congress to enact. Rome was not built in a day, and campaign finance reform obviously could not be enacted in a year. But I believe that early in the next Congress there will be a real chance to deal with the campaign finance issue in a bipartisan fashion to make the election in the Year 2000 cleaner and fairer than the one we just had or the one we are about to have. The American people deserve that as we enter a new century, and here is a promise: I will never, ever, give up this fight until we give it to them.

## THE NOMINATION OF JAMES C. HORMEL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as the 105th Congress draws to a close, I rise to express my disappointment over something we did not do. The Senate, despite strong support from both sides of the aisle, has not brought the nomination of James C. Hormel to serve as U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg to the floor, has not had a debate on the nomination, and has not had a vote on it.

This failure is really quite incomprehensible.

The President nominated James Hormel for this post on October 6, 1997. After a thorough review by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the committee approved the nomination by a vote of 16–2 and reported it to the full Senate with the recommendation that it be confirmed. And yet here it is, October 14, 1998, in the final hours of this Congress, and the nomination has not budged from the Executive Calendar.

Mr. Hormel is eminently qualified for the job of U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. He has had a diverse and distinguished career as a lawyer, businessman, educator, and philanthropist, and he gained diplomatic experience as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 51st U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva in 1995 and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 51st U.N. General Assembly in 1997. He was even confirmed unanimously by this very Senate for the latter post on May 23, 1997.

He has been an upstanding civic leader in San Francisco, and he has been honored for his work by organizations too numerous to mention. He is a man who is kind to all he meets, generous beyond measure, and deeply committed to making the world and his community a better place to live for all people. He is a devoted father of five grown children, and grandfather of 13. Anyone who knows him, as I have been privileged to do for over two decades, knows that he is a man of decency and honor, and the type of person who should be encouraged to be in public service.

So this is the situation we face: we have a nominee with outstanding talents and credentials; he was previously confirmed by this Senate for another post; he was approved by the Foreign Relations Committee by a 16–2 vote nearly a year ago; and over 60 Senators support bringing his nomination to a vote. And yet, we have never had the opportunity to vote on it.

Why? Because several Senators on the other side of the aisle have placed holds on the nomination, preventing a debate and a vote they knew they would lose. And the Majority Leader has refused to call up the nomination, effectively allowing the passage of time to kill it.

Why has Mr. Hormel been denied the Constitutionally delineated due process of a Senate debate and vote? The answer is simple: Mr. Hormel is gay. With no other reasonable grounds to block this nomination, one can come to no other conclusion than that some Senators are simply opposed to a gay man serving our country as a U.S. Ambassador. I believe the Senate does not want to allow this type of discrimination to prevail, and I think the vast majority of my colleagues agree. But so far, it appears that discrimination has prevailed.

I believe the majority of Americans agree with this position as well. To cite just one measure, newspaper editorials have appeared in support of Mr. Hormel's nomination across the country, including in the: Albany Times Union, Albuquerque Journal, Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, Atlanta Journal & Constitution, Boston Globe, Charleston (W.Va.) Gazette, Chicago Tribune, Cincinnati Post, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Detroit Free Press, Evansville Courier, Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Hartford Courant, Houston Chronicle, Los Angeles Times, Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Minneapolis-St. Paul Star-Tribune, Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, New Orleans Times Picayune, New York Daily News, New York Times, Peoria Journal-Star, Philadelphia Inquirer, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Portland Press Herald, Providence Journal, Riverside (Ca.) Press-Enterprise, Rocky Mountain News, San Diego Union-Tribune, San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner, Santa Rosa (Ca.) Press Democrat, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Springfield (Ill.) Journal-Register, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Petersburg Times, Syracuse Post-Standard, Tulsa World, Washington Post, and York (Pa.) Daily Record.

Many of these newspapers have also run op-ed columns which call for a vote on the nomination, as have the: Arizona Republic, Buffalo News, Columbus Dispatch, Dallas Morning News, Denver Post, Des Moines Register, Detroit News, Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, Greensboro News & Record, Madison Capital Times, Memphis Commercial Appeal, Northern New Jersey Record, Raleigh News & Observer, Salt Lake City Tribune, and USA Today.

I deeply regret that the Senate has not been permitted to have its say on this eminently qualified nominee solely because he is gay. But the Senate's failure to act need not prevent Mr. Hormel from assuming his post. In a case such as this, where the Senate has so clearly failed to fulfill its Constitutional obligation with respect to a nomination, even though a clear majority of the Senate supports that nomination, I believe it is entirely appropriate for the President to use his Constitutional authority to make a recess appointment.

Luxembourg is a NATO ally, and we need an ambassador there. Mr. Hormel has every qualification necessary to be an outstanding ambassador, and he would have been overwhelmingly confirmed if the Senate had been allowed to vote. But we were not. I, therefore, urge President Clinton, after Congress adjourns, to make a recess appointment of James Hormel to be U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. It is the right thing to do, and it will give the country the benefit of the service of James Hormel, which the Senate has failed to do.

Mr. President, because the Senate has not had the opportunity to debate this nomination, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD some of the materials I would have used in the course of that debate, including some of the notable editorials, op-ed pieces, and letters of support that have come to my attention.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 22, 1998]

GAME'S NOT OVER FOR HORMEL

Even though this hasn't been a notably busy or productive year for the U.S. Senate, Majority Leader Trent Lott has decided that there simply is no time available to vote on the nomination of James Hormel as ambassador to Luxembourg. Never mind that Hormel's confirmation has been pending since last fall, that hearings on his fitness have long since been completed or that Lott early on declared his unshakable belief that Hormel should not represent his country abroad because he is a homosexual. The excuse du jour is that the Senate calendar is